

**REMARKS**

Claims 12-23 are pending in the application. Claim 24 has been canceled.

**Specification and Claims**

Minor changes have been made to the specification to place it in better form for U.S. practice.

Further, minor changes have been made to the pending claims, without affecting the scope thereof, to place it in better form for U.S. practice.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In view of this, claim 23 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

(a) Claims 12-15 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghercioiu et al. (US 2004/0010734) in view of Hasako et al. (US 2003/0093715). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to claim:

wherein the second display control means displays the moving image of at least one of a time period from a predetermined time previous to said detection and a time period to a predetermined time after said detection.

Support for this feature is disclosed in page 23, lines 20-27 of the specification. Claim 23 has been amended in a similar manner.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the Ghercioiu reference discloses “video signal input means for receiving an input of video data generated based on a picked-up image of said control target equipment (Ghercioiu, pg 7, par. 80).”

Applicants respectfully disagree because Ghercioiu merely states in paragraph [0080] that the computer system shown in Fig. 3 has “a video display subsystem,” and does not disclose or suggest “video signal input means for receiving an input of video data generated based on a picked-up image of said control target equipment,” as recited in claim 12.

Further, the Examiner acknowledges that the Ghercioiu reference does not disclose or suggest the “second display control means” of the present invention. Therefore, the Examiner relies on the Hasako reference and alleges that it discloses the “second display control means” of the present invention by referring to Fig. 13a and page 17, paragraph 376 of the reference.

Applicants submit, however, that Hasako merely states, in paragraph [0376] that “As shown in Fig. 13(a), this causes the test video data superimposing the inspection result image data to be displayed on the display unit 31 of the display device 3.” More specifically, paragraph [0370] of Hasako states, “Then in step 38, the display switching circuit 36 of the display device 3 superimposes the inspection result image data outputted by the inspection result image generation circuit 37 on the received data (the test video data) outputted by the data reception circuit 38 and then outputs the resulting signal to the display unit 31.”

Therefore, Hasako merely discloses superimposing the inspection result image data on the test video data, and does not display “the moving image of at least one of a time period from

a predetermined time previous to said detection and a time period to a predetermined time after said detection,” as recited in claim 12.

In view of this, even assuming that Ghercioiu and Hasako can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Ghercioiu in view of Hasako does not disclose or suggest the “second display control means,” as recited in claim 12.

Claims 13-15 and 22, variously dependent on claim 12, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 12.

Claim 23 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 12.

Claim 24 has been canceled.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 16-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghercioiu in view of Hasako, and further in view of Keele et al. (US 2005/0086695). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16-21, indirectly dependent on claim 12, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 12.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

### Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi Reg. No. 40,417 at

the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  (reg. # 40,417)  
Charles Gorenstein  
Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant